



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—CAECILIUS OF CALACTE.

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF GREEK LITERARY CRITICISM.

In the time of Augustus the two leading critics in the literary world of Greece and Rome were Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Caecilius of Calacte. Of the merits of the former it is easy to judge from his extant works. The task is more difficult in the case of the latter, whose remains are few and fragmentary. Yet the figure of Caecilius is so interesting, and in some ways so significant, that it seems worth while to review the scattered notices of his life, and to form such general notions as we can of the nature of his writings. In this work of reconstruction not a little help may be obtained from a careful examination of the *Treatise on the Sublime*, a book attributed, by a tradition long since challenged, to Longinus, the minister of Queen Zenobia.

Suidas, our principal authority with regard to the life of Caecilius, tells us that he was a Sicilian rhetorician who practised at Rome in the time of Augustus Caesar, that he was according to some accounts of servile birth, that his original name was Archagathus, and that he was 'in faith a Jew.'¹ Suidas, it will be seen from the extract given below, adds (if the words are to be regarded as genuine) the surprising statement that his life extended till the advent of Hadrian, whose reign began more than a century after the death of Augustus. This inexactitude has led Blass to assume that Caecilius, the rhetorician, has here been confused with Q. Caecilius Niger, the quaestor of Verres, about whom Plutarch makes statements similar to those of

¹Suidas, s. v. Καικίλιος· Καικίλιος (κεκίλιος codd.) Σικελιώτης Καλαντιανός, Κάλαντις δὲ πόλις Σικελίας, ῥήτωρ, σοφιστεύσας ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος καὶ ἕως Ἀδριανοῦ, καὶ ἀπὸ δούλων, ὥς τινες ἱστορήκασιν, καὶ πρότερον μὲν καλούμενος Ἀρχάγαθος, τὴν δὲ δόξαν Ἰουδαίος. There seems little doubt (cp. Athen. VI 272, f; XI 466, a) that Καλακτῖνος and Καλάκτη should be read for Καλαντιανός and Κάλαντις. Archagathus, it may be added, seems to have been a specially Sicilian name: see G. Kaibel, Inscriptiones Graecae Siciliae, 210, 211, 212, 330 (conjecturally), 376.

Suidas.¹ It has led an earlier writer to go further still, and to assume the identity of the rhetorician and the quaestor.² But however much or however little truth there may be in these hypotheses, or in C. Müller's conjecture (F. H. G. III 331 *a*) that his ancestors had been brought as slaves from Syria to Sicily, it is not disputed that Caecilius Calactinus taught rhetoric at Rome, wherein he resembled Dionysius, of whom he was in fact an intimate friend.³

The biographical notes thus given by Suidas reappear, almost without variation, in the *Ἰωνιά* (*Violarium, bed of violets*) attributed to Eudocia, who flourished in the eleventh century, and was successively the wife of the emperors Constantine XI (Ducas) and Romanus IV (Diogenes). There is a like correspondence also in the lists of Caecilius' writings as supplied by Suidas and by Eudocia. The same works are mentioned, and in the same order.⁴ Departing from this order for the sake of convenience, we may classify the productions of Caecilius under the two heads of *history* and *literary criticism*.

Of the historical writings of Caecilius we know little. But the fact itself that he attempted history is not without an interest of its own, quite apart from the further point of contact which it affords between him and Dionysius. Athenaeus, who is here our principal informant, says that a history of the Servile Wars in Sicily was brought out by Caecilius the rhetorician of Calacte.⁵ When we remember that Caecilius was himself, according to the story, of servile origin, and when we remember, further, that his town of Calacte had been founded by the rebel leader of an earlier era, Ducetius, we can imagine that he would recount the exploits of Spartacus with peculiar zest. Athenaeus also refers to a treatise of his on history, which contained an anecdote of

¹ Plut. Cic. VII: ἀπελευθερικὸς ἄνθρωπος, ἐνοχὸς τῷ ἰουδαΐζειν, ὄνομα Κεκίλιος.—Friedrich Blass, Die griechische Beredsamkeit in dem Zeitraum von Alexander bis auf Augustus, p. 174. But cp. Th. Reinach, Revue des Études Juives, XXVI 36.

² G. Buchenau, De scriptore libri περὶ ὕψους, pp. 41, 42.

³ Dionys. Hal., Epist. ad Cn. Pompeium, p. 777 (ed. Reiske): ἐμοὶ μέντοι καὶ τῷ φίλτάτῳ Κακίλιῳ δοκεῖ τὰ ἐνθυμήματα αὐτοῦ (sc. Θουκυδίδου) μάλιστα γὰρ καὶ ζηλῶσαι Δημοσθένους.

⁴ On the spuriousness of the *Ἰωνιά* see Pulch, Hermes, XVII 177; A. J. P. III 489, IV 109, V 114 f., VII 104.

⁵ Athenaeus, VI 272, *f*: σύγγραμμά τε ἐκδέδωκε περὶ τῶν δουλικῶν πολέμων Κακίλιος ὁ ῥήτωρ ὁ ἀπὸ Καλῆς ἀκτῆς.

the Sicilian tyrant Agathocles.¹ Whether the work in question was theoretical or practical we cannot say. It may have been identical with one given under a somewhat different title in Suidas' list.²

And now we approach Caecilius in his special rôle, that of a literary critic. And first of all it is worth notice that his more purely literary, or aesthetic, judgments rested on a sufficiently solid foundation of verbal scholarship. He was not wanting on the technical, philological, grammatical side. The key-note of his literary activity was sounded in his *κατὰ Φρυνῶν*, which was, as its title indicates, a kind of *Antibarbarus*.³ His energies were chiefly spent in waging war against the licence of the Asiatic school, and in inculcating a pure Attic style. As a means to the same end he prepared that 'select glossary' of Attic phrases to which Suidas refers, and also a lexicon of rhetorical terms (*λεξικὸν ῥητορικόν*). Both of these were destined to have many subsequent imitators, the latter being the prototype of Harpocration, from one of whose articles, indeed, its existence is chiefly inferred. Caecilius seems also to have written an *art of rhetoric*, and a work on *figures*.⁴ The latter is frequently quoted by other Greek rhetoricians and by Quintilian.⁵

¹ Athenaeus, XI 466, a: Καικίλιος δ' ὁ ῥήτωρ, ὁ ἀπὸ Καλῆς ἀκτῆς, ἐν τῷ περὶ ἱστορίας Ἀγαθοκλέα φησὶ τὸν τύραννον, ἐκπώματα χρυσᾷ ἐπιδεικνύντα, τοῖς ἐταίροις φάσκειν, ἐξ ὧν ἐκεράμηνσε κατεσκευασμένα ταῦτα.

² Suidas, I. c., περὶ τῶν καθ' ἱστορίαν ἢ παρ' ἱστορίαν εἰρημένων τοῖς ῥήτορσιν. This title would seem to show that Caecilius was well aware that the rhetorician did not always make an ideal historian.

³ Suidas' enumeration of Caecilius' writings may be conveniently given here in full from Imm. Bekker's edition, p. 555: βιβλία δὲ αὐτοῦ πολλὰ, κατὰ Φρυνῶν β'· ἔστι δὲ κατὰ στοιχεῖον ἀπόδειξις τοῦ εἰρῆσθαι πᾶσαν λέξιν καλλιρρημοσύνης· ἔστι δὲ ἐκλογὴ λέξεων κατὰ στοιχεῖον· σύγκρισις Δημοσθένους καὶ Κικέρωνος· τίμη διαφέρει ὁ Ἀττικὸς ζῆλος τοῦ Ἀσιανοῦ· περὶ τοῦ χαρακτήρος τῶν ῥητόρων· σύγκρισις Δημοσθένους καὶ Αἰσχίνου· περὶ Δημοσθένους, ποῖοι αὐτοῦ γνήσιοι λόγοι καὶ ποῖοι νόθοι· περὶ τῶν καθ' ἱστορίαν [ἢ παρ' ἱστορίαν, codd. et G. Bernhardius] εἰρημένων τοῖς ῥήτορσιν, καὶ ἄλλα πλείστα.—In the section at present under consideration Blass suggests: κατὰ Φρυνῶν β'· ἔστι δὲ ἀπόδειξις τοῦ (δεῖν) εἰρῆσθαι πᾶσαν λέξιν ἐν καλλιρρημοσύνῃ· ἔτι δὲ ἐκλογὴ λέξεων κατὰ στοιχεῖον. M. H. E. Meier (Opuscula Academica, I 131) proposed μετὰ καλλιρρημοσύνης. By καλλιρρημοσύνη 'elegance of diction' seems to be meant.

⁴ τέχνη ῥητορικὴ and περὶ σχημάτων. For the former cp. Quintil., Inst. Orat. III 1, 16.

⁵ By the rhetoricians Alexander περὶ σχημάτων (Spengel, Rhetores Graeci. III 7-40), Phoebammon σχόλια περὶ σχημάτων ῥητορικῶν (ibid. III 41-56), and Tiberius περὶ σχημάτων (ibid. III 57-82). By Quintilian, IX 3, 89: haec

Next come two works of a more distinctly literary cast, one illustrating the differences of the Attic and the Asiatic style, and the other characterising the ten (Attic) orators.¹ In both these writings Caecilius was on ground which he had made specially his own. Atticism as opposed to Asiaticism was his great pre-occupation, and it is in him that we find the first specific reference to the so-called canon of the ten Attic orators. That he was the first to frame the canon, we are hardly entitled to assert, though many good authorities have held that view. The probability, rather, seems to be that it should be referred neither to Rome and Caecilius, nor yet (as the traditional opinion among scholars since Ruhnken's time has been) to Alexandria, but to Pergamus and the end of the second century B. C.² Pergamus, like Alexandria, was a notable centre of learning. Rhetoric in particular flourished greatly there, as in Asia Minor generally, whereas at Alexandria it was but little studied. Over and above this general treatise on the distinctive features of the ten Attic orators, Caecilius wrote separately on the authenticity of the speeches of Demosthenes, on Antiphon, and on Lysias.³

omnia (viz. the whole question of rhetorical figures) copiosius sunt exsecuti, qui non ut partem operis transcurrerunt, sed proprie libros huic operi dedicaverunt, sicut Caecilius, Dionysius, Rutilius, Cornificius, Visellius alique non pauci, sed non minor erit eorum qui vivunt gloria. The same treatise is probably indicated in Quintilian, V 10, 7; IX 3, 38, 46, 91, 97.

¹Suidas, l. c.: *τίνι διαφέρει ὁ Ἀττικὸς ζῆλος τοῦ Ἀσιανοῦ and περὶ τοῦ χαρακτήρος τῶν ἱ ῥητόρων*. Liddell and Scott interpret ζῆλος of Asiatic *extravagance*. But the title of Caecilius' book seems to suggest a more general meaning, such as *emulation, imitation, manner*. At the same time the word appears to be used specially of the Asiatic school. Cp. Plut., Anton. Vit. 2: *ἐχρήτο δὲ τῷ καλοῦ μένῳ μὲν Ἀσιανῶ ζήλῳ τῶν λόγων ἀνθοῦντι μάλιστα κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον, ἔχοντι δὲ πολλὰν ὁμοιότητα πρὸς τὸν βίον αὐτοῦ κομπῶδη καὶ φρηγματίαν ὄντα καὶ κενοῦ γανυράματος καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἀνωμάλου μεστόν*, and Strabo, 648: *Ἐγησίας ὁ ῥήτωρ, ὃς ἦρξε μάλιστα τοῦ Ἀσιανοῦ λεγομένου ζήλου, παραφθείρας τὸ καθεστηκὸς ἔθος τὸ Ἀττικόν*.

²See Brzoska's learned and ingenious dissertation, *De Canone Decem Oratorum Quaestiones*, Vratislaviae, 1883. H. Usener, however, declares for Alexandria: Dionysii Hal. librorum de imitatione reliquiae, p. 132.

³Suidas, l. c.: *περὶ Δημοσθένους, ποιοὶ αὐτοῦ γνήσιοι λόγοι καὶ ποιοὶ νόθοι*, [Plutarch], X Oratorum Vitae, 832 E: *Κακίλιος ἐν τῷ περὶ αὐτοῦ (sc. Ἀντιφῶντος) συντάγματι*. [Longinus], *περὶ Ὑψους*, XXXII 8: *ὁ Κεκίλιος ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ Δυσίου συγγράμμασιν*. In this last passage the plural and the preposition are to be noted. Caecilius, it seems to be implied, often dealt with Lysias, and in the spirit of an advocate rather than a judge. Cp. Baudat, *Étude sur Denys d'Halicarnasse et le Traité de la Disposition des Mots*, p. 16.

Photius has preserved a passage from the book on Antiphon in which Caecilius remarks that that orator seldom uses the 'figures of thought,' and only where nature herself is his prompter.¹ By 'figures of thought' (σχήματα διανοίας) Caecilius denoted irony, rhetorical question, and the like, as distinguished from 'figures of language' (σχήματα λέξεως), viz. assonance, balance of clauses, and so on. The whole passage is interesting, and it forms the longest fragment we possess of Caecilius.²

The consideration of Caecilius' attitude towards another Attic orator, Lysias, brings us, as we have already noted, into direct contact with the *De Sublimitate*. In the thirty-second chapter of that treatise we read: 'Fastening on such defects [as have previously been mentioned], Caecilius, in his writings in praise of Lysias, ventured to make the assertion that Lysias was altogether superior to Plato. In so doing he gave way to his feelings, unlike a true critic, in two respects. Loving Lysias better than his own person, he nevertheless hates Plato more perfectly than he loves Lysias. He is carried away by the spirit of contention, and even his premises are not, as he thought, admitted. For he prefers the orator, as faultless and immaculate, to Plato as one who has often made mistakes. But the facts are not of this nature, nor anything like it.'³

If we accept this passage without qualification, we shall certainly feel bound to form a poor opinion of Caecilius as a judge of great literature. But we must not forget that the *De Sublimitate* is a polemical treatise. As its opening words show, it is directed against those shortcomings of Caecilius which suggested its preparation. Moreover, the author of the treatise cannot, surely, himself wish to imply more, at the most, than that Caecilius compared the two as writers solely, and not as thinkers and artists. The author (whoever he was) and Caecilius were, both of them, opposed to Asianism; and Caecilius may well have held

¹ Phot., Cod. 259, p. 485 B. 29, Bekker.

² Cp. R. C. Jebb, *Attic Orators*², I 28; F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*², I 118.—The following definition of a figure is attributed by Phoebammon (Spengel, *Rhett. Gr.* III 34) to Caecilius: Κακίλιος δὲ ὁ Καλακτίτης (codd. καλανδότης) ὥριστο οὕτω· σχήμα ἐστὶ τροπὴ εἰς τὸ μὴ κατὰ φύσιν τὸ τῆς διανοίας καὶ λέξεως. Is this to be harmonised with the passage in Photius on Shakespeare's principle that it is sometimes natural to be unnatural? 'This is an art | Which does mend nature, change it rather, but | The art itself is nature,' Winter's Tale, IV 4.

³ περὶ ὑψηλότητος, XXXII 8.

that, from this and other points of view, Lysias was a safer model for the young student of composition than Plato. So to hold would simply be to recognise that average humanity should choose more modest standards than those presented by the loftiest and most daringly original genius. But, however interpreted, the critic's words can hardly be acquitted of the charge of exaggeration; they seem to show that he was himself 'carried away by the spirit of contention.' At all events, we know from another source that Caecilius was no such blind and uncritical admirer of Lysias as is here suggested. On the contrary, he found fault with him on the ground that he was less skilful in the arrangement of arguments than in invention.¹

It will be well here to quote, without abridgment, from the *De Sublimitate* its opening sentence, for in the original it is all one sentence, though rather a long one: 'You will remember, my dear Postumius Terentianus, that when we examined together the treatise of Caecilius on the Sublime, we found that it fell below the dignity of the whole subject, while it failed signally to grasp the essential points, and in consequence conveyed to its readers but little of that practical help which it should be a writer's principal aim to give. In every systematic treatise two things are required. The first is, to indicate what the subject is. The second in order ranks higher in importance. It concerns the means and methods by which we may attain our end. Now, Caecilius essays to show the nature of the sublime by countless instances, as though our ignorance demanded it, but the consideration of the means whereby we can avail to bring our own natures to a certain pitch of elevation he has, in some strange way, passed by as unnecessary. However, it may be the man ought not so much to be blamed for his omissions as praised for his happy thought and his enthusiasm.'

It is clear from this preface that Caecilius had written a treatise—apparently a short one—of which the subject, and probably the title, was *περὶ ὑψους*. This treatise his successor in the same field, a writer who is now generally supposed to have belonged to the first century of our era rather than to the third, had examined in conjunction with his young Roman friend Postumius Terentianus.²

¹ Phot., Cod. 262, p. 489 B. 13.

² It should be noted that the MSS, in this passage, give the name as *Ποστούμει Φλωρεντιανέ*. I hope to discuss this reading elsewhere, in connexion with the general subject of the authorship of the *περὶ ὑψους*.

They had found in it much to desire, but due credit is given to its author for originality in his choice of theme.¹

The work of Caecilius on the Sublime has been lost entirely, and that of his successor exists only in a mutilated form, about one-third of it having disappeared. It is therefore impossible to speak with any certainty about the two books and their relation to one another. But it seems open to question whether the later treatise was not guilty, to some extent, of the omission which, in its proëmium, it imputes to the earlier. In any case, it seems to have trodden closely in the footsteps of Caecilius, especially when treating of *figures* and *tropes*. The references to Caecilius are either direct or indirect. The direct references, besides those already mentioned, are the following. In the eighth chapter we are told that he had omitted some of the five sources of elevated speech, passion (*πάθος*) being specially mentioned. Towards the end of the chapter we have the same criticism driven home thus: 'If, however, Caecilius considered that passion never contributes at all to sublimity, and if it was for this reason that he did not deem it worthy of mention, he is altogether deceived. I would affirm with confidence that there is no tone so lofty as that of genuine passion, in its right place, when it bursts forth in a wild gust of mad enthusiasm, and fills the words, so to say, with frenzy.' In c. XXXI Caecilius is again taken to task: 'In this way, too, that original expression of Theopompus merits praise. Owing to the correspondence between word and thing, it seems to me to be very expressive; and yet Caecilius, for some unexplained reason, finds fault with it. "Philip," says Theopompus, "had a genius for *stomaching* (*ἀναγκοφayῆσαι*) things." Now, a homely expression is sometimes much more telling than eloquent language, for it is understood at once, since it is drawn from

¹ There seems no valid reason for questioning this originality, though from the nature of the case we cannot demonstrate it. At first sight it might seem likely in itself that a man with Hebrew inclinations should conceive the idea. But we do not know precisely what was Caecilius' attitude to his theme. It would, however, appear probable, from the character of his own fragments and from his known regard for Lysias, that he favoured a plain rather than a heightened style. But we suffer everywhere from want of information. For instance, we cannot tell whether he confined (as he might almost seem to have done) his investigations to prose-writers, and excluded the poets, who figure so largely in the *De Sublimitate*. Nor yet can we assert that he did, or did not, agree with so many of his Greek and Roman contemporaries and successors in associating literary criticism with art-criticism.

common life, and the fact that it is familiar only makes it the more convincing. So the words 'stomaching things' are used most strikingly of a man who, for the sake of attaining his own ends, patiently and with cheerfulness endures things shameful and vile.' In the next chapter it is mentioned, apparently in an approving rather than in a merely critical spirit, that 'with regard to the number of metaphors to be employed, Caecilius seems to assent to the view of those who lay it down that two, or at the most three, should be ranged together in the same passage.' Finally, when in c. IV the author is illustrating the vice of *frigidity* from the writings of the historian Timaeus, he excuses himself from a lengthy enumeration of examples on the ground that 'most of them have already been quoted by Caecilius.'

Thus the direct references are, as usually happens when a new writer is treating a subject previously handled by some one else, of a rather controversial nature. But this is not all. The general contents of the treatise, and its sequence, or want of sequence, seem to be influenced by the fact that the author had the book of Caecilius before him, and assumed the same of his reader or readers. This is probably also the explanation of the rather abrupt way in which some of the literary illustrations make their appearance. And we may possibly include among indirect allusions to Caecilius such expressions as τὸν γράφοντα in c. XXXVI 3, where the passage runs: 'In reply, however, to the writer who maintains that the faulty Colossus is not superior to the Doryphorus of Polycleitus, it may be readily said, among many other things, that,' etc.; and the words ὁ τοῖς χρηστομαθοῦσιν ἐπιτιμῶν in c. II 3, where the complete sentence is: 'If, I say, the critic of those who desire to learn were to turn these matters over in his mind, he would no longer, it seems to me, regard the investigation of the subject as unnecessary and useless.' It has also been maintained that in c. II 1 the word φησί should be understood of Caecilius, but this does not seem altogether probable. There is a more likely instance in XXIX 1.¹

¹ On the whole question see M. Rothstein in *Hermes*, XXIII 1-20; L. Martens, *De Libello Περὶ Ὑψους*, Bonnæ, 1877; Morawski, *Quaestiones Quintilianæ*, Posnaniae, 1874, and *De Dionysii et Caecilii Studiis Rhetoricis in Rheinisches Museum*, XXXIV, pp. 370 seqq.; Burckhardt, *Caecilii Rhetoris Fragmenta*, Basileae, 1863; Weise, *Quaestiones Caecilianae*, Berolini, 1888; F. Caccialanza, *Cecilio da Calatte e l'Ellenismo a Roma nel secolo di Augusto* (*Rivista di Filologia*, XVIII 1-73).

Suidas, it will have been noticed, ascribes to Caecilius a comparison between Demosthenes and Aeschines, and another between Demosthenes and Cicero. On the subject of the latter comparison, Plutarch in his *Life of Demosthenes* has some caustic remarks. We will forego, says he, the task of contrasting the two orators, and of pronouncing upon their superiority in charm or intensity. We must remember, he continues, the proverb about *a fish out of water*, which 'the all-accomplished Caecilius overlooked when he had the hardihood to publish a comparison between Demosthenes and Cicero. However, it may well be that if the saying *Know thyself* were always present to everybody's mind, it would not have been thought a divine behest.'¹

These severe strictures upon Caecilius recall the equally severe remark, already quoted from the *De Sublimitate*, that 'although he loved Lysias better than his own person, he nevertheless hated Plato more than he loved Lysias.' Clearly, Caecilius was unpopular. He may have been one of those men who are described, by those who like them, as original and versatile, and by those who like them not, as self-confident and audacious. We cannot disregard the mild irony of Plutarch, whose attitude is usually kindly; yet neither can we fail to recognise in Caecilius a pioneer in the fruitful region of comparative literature. And he must have been doubly a pioneer if there is truth in the suggestion that the author of the *De Sublimitate* owes to him, as being 'in faith a Jew,' his celebrated reference to the 'legislator of the Jews' and to a passage 'at the very commencement of his Book of Laws.'² There must have been originality, and true scientific instinct, in the man who, probably for the first time, compared, in however rudimentary a way, three several literatures. The *De Sublimitate* itself has a comparison—this too, very possibly, suggested by Caecilius—between Demosthenes and Cicero, in which the author likens the former to a thunderbolt, the latter to a conflagration. But it is there prefaced by an apology: *if we too, as Greeks, are permitted to form an opinion upon the point*.³ This, seemingly, is also Plutarch's doubt. If the doubt were caused by the con-

¹ Plut., Vit. Demosth., c. III: τὸ δὲ τοὺς λόγους ἀντεξετάζειν καὶ ἀποφαίνεσθαι, πότερος ἥδιον ἢ δεινότερος εἰπεῖν, ἐάσομεν. κακεῖ γάρ, ὡς φησιν ὁ Ἰων, δελφινὸς ἐν χέρσῳ βία, ἣν ὁ περιττὸς ἐν ἅπασι Κεκίλιος ἀγνοήσας ἐνεανεύσατο σύγκρισιν τοῦ Δημοσθένους καὶ Κικέρωνος ἐξενεγκεῖν. ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἴσως, εἰ παντὸς ἦν τὸ Γνωθῆαι σε αὐτὸν ἔχειν πρόχειρον, οὐκ ἂν ἐδόκει πρόσταγμα θεῖον εἶναι.

² De Subl. IX 9.

³ Ibid. XII 4.

sciousness of imperfect knowledge of Latin, it was creditable to those who felt and owned it; but if it were due to any awe of the Roman conqueror, it would be spurned by Caecilius, who hailed from Sicily, the birthplace of rhetoric, and who had chronicled the intrepid resistance there offered to the Roman power by Spartacus.¹

It is in the independence of mind which led Caecilius, if we are right, to bring three literatures into comparison, that we seem to detect his true significance and originality. The historian of ideas—especially of rhetorical or literary ideas—must always speak with due diffidence. He is not entitled to affirm more than that, as far as his researches have gone, this or that thinker was the parent of this or that idea. With this substantial reservation, it may be claimed that Caecilius inaugurates the era of comparative literary criticism. And this, if it stood alone, would be enough to make him the man of mark he clearly was among his contemporaries and successors.

But he was also, together with his friend Dionysius, in the thick of a great movement for the purification of literary taste, the movement comprehensively known as *Atticism*. He was one of the leaders in the revolt against the tendency to prefer the florid writers (broadly termed *Asiatic*) of the age between Demosthenes and Cicero to the Attic writers of an earlier and a better time. In this controversy some originality, as well as much vigour, may safely be attributed to him. It is possible, as Wilamowitz von Moellendorff maintains, that the Atticist revival began with Apollodorus of Pergamus, who was the teacher of Octavianus and probably of Caecilius.² But it would appear that

¹ It would be interesting to determine, if we could, what knowledge of Latin was possessed by Caecilius, Dionysius Halic., Plutarch, and the author of the *De Sublimitate*. Egger's essay *De l'étude de la langue latine chez les Grecs dans l'antiquité* (contained in his *Mémoires d'histoire ancienne et de philologie*) may be consulted in the matter.—I do not think it has previously been remarked that Vaucher's elaborately developed theory that Plutarch was the author of the *De Sublimitate* seems to break down (even if there were no other objections to it) in the presence of the set comparison which the treatise contains between the oratory of Demosthenes and that of Cicero. At the same time, the evidently close relation in which the treatise stands to Caecilius is one of the chief reasons for rejecting the tradition of its third-century authorship.

² *Hermes*, XII 333; but see, on the other hand, Rohde in *Rheinisches Museum*, XLI 176.—*Suet.*, Aug. 89, and *Quint.* IX 1, 12.

Apollodorus approached the whole question in a somewhat narrow scholastic spirit. That is, at all events, the impression we form of the schools headed by Apollodorus and his rival Theodorus of Gadara.¹ They lost themselves in rhetorical rules and subtleties.² Dionysius and Caecilius seem to have stood on an altogether higher plane. They were true men of letters, not mere masters of technic. Their view of literary criticism was not mechanical, but aesthetic. They had something of the wide outlook and sympathy possessed by the best Roman writers, such as Cicero, for whom the adoption of a pure Attic standard had a living, and not simply an antiquarian interest.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF NORTH WALES, BANGOR.

¹ Theodorus was the teacher of Tiberius, of whom he gave the famous definition *πηλὸς αἵματι πεφυραμένος* (Suet., Tiber. 57); and probably also of the author of the *Treatise on the Sublime* (cf. the use of *ἐκάλει* in the reference to him in *De Subl.* III 5).

² Strabo, p. 625; καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος ὁ ῥήτωρ ὁ τὰς τέχνας συγγράψας καὶ τὴν Ἀπολλοδώρειον αἵρεσιν παραγαγών, ἥτις ποτ' ἐστί· πολλὰ γὰρ ἐπεκράτει, μείζονα δὲ ἢ καθ' ἡμῶς ἔχοντα τὴν κρίσιν, ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ Ἀπολλοδώρειος αἵρεσις καὶ ἡ Θεοδώρειος. Tacitus, *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, XIX: iam vero longa principiorum praeparatio et narrationis alte repetita series et multarum divisionum ostentatio et mille argumentorum gradus et quidquid aliud aridissimis Hermagorae et Apollodori libris praecipitur, in honore erat.